

REMARKS**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 10, 12, 13, 17, 18, 22-24, and 28 under 35 U.S.C §102(e), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,741,851 Lee et al. (“Lee”). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant asserts that the cited reference fails to anticipate Applicant’s invention as claimed in claims 1, 2, 10, 12, 13, 17, 18, 22-24, and 28.

Lee discloses a “method for protecting data stored in a lost mobile terminal and a recording medium for storing the data are provided.” (Lee abstract) The method includes utilizing an unreadable data request for making stored data unreadable and/or a data removal request for deleting stored data. (Lee, column 4, lines 45-47). Other methods for making stored data unreadable include hashing and mapping stored data onto null characters , making the input/output function of a portable telephone inoperable, or completely removing stored data (Lee, column 4, lines 49-52).

With respect to independent claim 1 in the presently claimed invention, Applicant teaches and claims “A method, comprising sending a message on a wireless network to a mobile computer and disabling the mobile computer upon receipt of the message.”

(Claim 1) (Emphasis added)

In the Examiner’s office action mailed on October 20, 2005, the Examiner claims that Lee’s method as detailed in Lee’s detailed description column 4, lines 45-55 anticipate Applicant’s limitation of “disabling the mobile computer upon receipt of the message.” Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s characterization. In the section of Lee’s detailed description referenced by the Examiner, Lee just describes

particular methods to make specific stored data unreadable. Lee does not make any reference to “disabling [a] mobile computer upon receipt of [a] message” as is claimed in the limitation of Applicant’s claim 1. Teaching how to make specific stored data unreadable is not similar to teaching how to disable a mobile computer. Therefore, because Lee at least does not teach “disabling [a] mobile computer upon receipt of [a] message”, Applicant respectfully submits that Lee does not teach or anticipate claim 1 of the presently claimed invention.

In regard to independent claims 17 and 23, Lee does not anticipate Applicant’s invention for the same reason as independent claim 1. Again, Lee at least does not teach “disabling [a] mobile computer upon receipt of [a] message.” Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Lee does not teach or anticipate claims 17 and 23 of the presently claimed invention.

Claims 2, 10, 12, 13, 18, 22, 24, and 28 depend from and further limit independent claims 1, 17, and 23, respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons advanced above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Lichtman does not teach or anticipate claims 2, 10, 12, 13, 18, 22, 24, and 28.

As such, Lee does not teach or anticipate Applicant’s invention as claimed in pending claims 1, 2, 10, 12, 13, 17, 18, 22-24, and 28. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 2, 10, 12, 13, 17, 18, 22-24, and 28.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 3-6, 8, 9, 16, 19-21, and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C §103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,741,851 Lee et al. (“Lee”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,774,797 Freathy et al. (“Freathy”) and US Patent Application No. 2003/0199267 Iwasa et al. (“Iwasa”). Additionally, the Examiner has rejected claims 7, 14, and 15 under 35 U.S.C §103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,741,851 Lee et al. (“Lee”), U.S. Patent No. 6,774,797 Freathy et al. (“Freathy”) and US Patent Application No. 2003/0199267 Iwasa et al. (“Iwasa”) as applied to claim 4, and further in view of US Patent No. 6,757,531 Haaramo et al. (“Haaramo”). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant asserts that the cited references fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious Applicant’s invention as claimed in claims 3-9, 14-16, 19-21, and 25-27.

Freathy discloses a tracking tag system worn by an individual in cooperation with a monitoring center to monitor the individual’s location. Additionally, the system allows for permissible and impermissible activities for the tag wearer. (Freathy abstract)

Iwasa discloses an information processing apparatus equipped multiple communication modules that are wirelessly linked. The apparatus can keep an OS from starting if a password is not entered. (Iwasa abstract)

Haaramo discloses a method for voice based communication between a number of mobile terminals of a telecommunication network. The method includes steps of creating a group of terminals and storing group information in each of the terminals. Additionally, the method includes recording a voice message in one terminal, dispatching that message to the other terminals, and receiving the message at the other terminals. (Haaramo abstract)

Claims 3-9, 14-16, 19-21, and 25-27 are dependent upon independent claims 1, 17, and 23 respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons advanced above with respect to independent claims 1, 17, and 23, Applicant respectfully submits that Lee, Freathy, Iwasa, and Haaramo, each taken alone or in combination, do not render these dependent claims obvious. Thus, because Lee, Freathy, Iwasa, and Haaramo, each taken alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest, or render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in pending claims 3-9, 14-16, 19-21, and 25-27, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 3-9, 14-16, 19-21, and 25-27.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No 02-2666.
If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Michael J. Mallie at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 12/30/08

[Signature]

Michael J. Mallie (Reg. No. 36,591)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300